

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 878

TM 016 427

AUTHOR Clauser, Brian E.; And Others
TITLE Influence of the Criterion Variable on the Identification of Differentially Functioning Test Items Using the Mantel-Haenszel Statistic. Lab Report 198.
SPONS AGENCY Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.
PUB DATE 5 Mar 91
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; *Anglo Americans; Comparative Testing; High Schools; *High School Students; *Item Bias; Item Response Theory; Minority Groups; *Test Items; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Criterion Variables; *Mantel Haenszel Procedure; New Mexico High School Proficiency Examination

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the effectiveness of the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) statistic in detecting differentially functioning test items when the internal criterion is varied. Using a data set from the 1982 statewide administration of a 150-item life skills examination (the New Mexico High School Proficiency Examination), a randomly selected sample of 1,000 Anglo-American and 1,000 Native American examinee item response sets was analyzed. The MH procedure was first applied to all of the items involved. The items were then categorized as belonging to one or more of four subtests based on the skills or knowledge needed to choose the correct response. Each subtest was then analyzed as a separate test, using the MH procedure. Three control subtests were also established using random assignment of test items, and they were analyzed using the MH procedure. Based on three runs of a MH computer program analyzing a total of 91 items, 22 items were identified as functioning differentially in the two examinee groups. The choice of criterion--total test score versus subtest score--had a substantial influence on the classification of items according to whether or not they were differentially functioning in the Anglo-American and Native American groups. Evidence for the convergence of judgmental and statistical procedures was found in the unusually high proportion of differentially functioning items within one of the classifications, and in the results of the reanalysis of this group of items. Two tables present data from the analyses. (Author/SLD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

03/05/91

Influence of the Criterion Variable on the Identification of
Differentially Functioning Test Items Using the
Mantel-Haenszel Statistic

Brian E. Clauser, Kathleen Mazor, and Ronald K. Hambleton
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Abstract

The potential for bias in testing is of considerable concern to test developers, test users, and minority group members. In the current study, the effectiveness of the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) statistic in detecting differentially functioning test items when the internal criterion was varied was investigated.

Using a dataset from a statewide administration of a life skills examination, a sample of 1000 Anglo-American and 1000 Native American examinee item response sets were analyzed. The MH procedure was first applied to all of the items involved. The items were then categorized as belonging to one or more of four subtests based on the skills or knowledge needed to choose the correct response. Each subtest was then analyzed as a separate test, using the MH procedure. Three control subtests were also established using random assignment of test items. These subtests, too, were analyzed using the MH procedure.

The results revealed that the choice of criterion, total test score vs. subtest score, had a substantial influence on the classification of items as to whether or not they were differentially functioning in the American and Native American groups. Also, evidence for the convergence of judgmental and statistical procedures was found in the unusually high proportion of differentially functioning items within one of the classifications, and in the results of the re-analysis of this group of items.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

RON HAMBLETON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Influence of the Criterion Variable on the Identification of
Differentially Functioning Test Items Using the
Mantel-Haenszel Statistic^{1,2,3,4}

Brian E. Clauser, Kathleen Mazor, and Ronald K. Hambleton
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Standardized tests have become an integral part of modern society. Test results are widely used to inform decisions on acceptance and advancement in education, career advancement, and the provision of special services. Because of the increasing impact of test results in these important areas, the use of standardized tests has become a controversial social and political issue. One of the most important areas of controversy has been the issue of bias in testing. Biased test items result in one subgroup of a population having an advantage over another on the biased items and, depending on the makeup of the test, sometimes on the test as a whole. In many cases, items which have been identified as biased favor majority group members over minority group members.

Because of the importance of the item bias issue, considerable attention has been devoted to the development and evaluation of methodologies for detecting differentially functioning test items (see, for example, Berk, 1982; Raju, Bode, & Larsen, 1989; Scheuneman & Bleistein, 1989). Later, items identified as "differentially functioning" (DIF) in two groups can be studied closely to determine whether the difference is due to bias in the test item or some other cause. The use of the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) statistic (Holland &

¹Laboratory of Psychometric and Evaluative Research Report No. 198.
Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, School of Education.

²Paper presented at the meeting of the AERA, Boston, 1990.

³The project was supported by a research grant from the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

⁴The authors are grateful to John Hattie, University of Western Australia, for helpful comments on the interpretation of results.

Thayer, 1988) has emerged as one the most popular procedures (see, for example, Bennett, Rock, & Novatkoski, 1989; Zwick & Ercikan, 1989).

There are a number of likely reasons for the popularity of the MH approach. Like the more complex IRT based procedures, the MH builds on a widely accepted conceptual basis wherein an item is differentially functioning if examinees of the same ability but belonging to different subgroups have different probabilities of choosing the correct response. The Mantel-Haenszel statistic is one of several conditional item bias methods currently popular in the testing field (Mellenbergh, 1989). However, in contrast to some of the IRT based item bias detection procedures, the calculations involved are relatively simple, resulting in relatively low computer costs. Also, an acceptable test of significance for the MH exists (Holland & Thayer, 1988), and the Mantel-Haenszel procedure can produce reliable results with sample sizes considerably below the size needed for the IRT procedures (see, for example, Scheuneman & Bleistein, 1989). Finally, direct comparisons of the Mantel-Haenszel and IRT procedures have demonstrated substantial agreement between them (Hambleton & Rogers, 1989). In light of the popularity of the Mantel-Haenszel procedure, and its advantages as noted above, it seemed appropriate to examine the functioning of this procedure in some detail.

Purpose

The use of the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) statistic, like other chi-square and IRT procedures for detecting differential item functioning (DIF), rests on two basic assumptions. The first assumption is that the test scores are reliable. Second, the assumption is made that the overall test is valid and therefore total test score can provide a meaningful criterion against which to interpret item performance in the two groups of interest. It is commonly assumed that the total test score is the most practical and appropriate criterion, and

leads to valid results. However, the stability of MH results across alternative criteria has been a concern to some researchers. For example, Bollwark, Hambleton, and Rogers (1990) compared MH results based on internal and external criteria. They found the results to be quite similar across the two standards. The present paper extends this examination of the MH statistic's stability across criteria by comparing the MH results across differing internal criteria. It is evident that even tests which appear statistically to be unidimensional contain items measuring more than one skill. The question then is to what extent does the total test score stand as an appropriate criterion against which group performance on individual items within the test can be compared? It was predicted that systematically changing the grouping of test items analyzed would result in some items showing substantial changes in their MH statistic.

Method

Test Data and Examinee Samples

The dataset for the study was collected during the 1982 administration of the New Mexico High School Proficiency Exam (NMHSPE). It contained the responses of 23,000 students to 150 test items. The NMHSPE is intended to measure five major "life skills" areas: knowledge of community resources, consumer economics, government and law, mental and physical health, and occupational knowledge. Included in the 23,000 total were approximately 8,000 Anglo-American and 2,600 Native American students. These two groups were chosen for comparison for three reasons: (1) their scores represented a relatively extreme case of differing ability distributions, (2) a previous study (Hambleton & Rogers, 1989) had indicated that the data set contained several differentially functioning items, and (3) Native American groups have been underutilized in item bias research studies.

Description of the Mantel-Haenszel Statistic

In calculating the Mantel-Haenszel statistic, the majority and minority groups are first matched on the criterion of interest. In most cases the best available criterion is the total test score, either with the exclusion of the item under evaluation or with the exclusion of all items judged as having a significant likelihood of being biased. The Mantel-Haenszel statistic represents "the average factor by which the odds that a reference group (majority) member gets an item correct exceeds the corresponding odds for comparable focal group (minority) members" (Holland & Thayer, 1988). Also, Holland and Thayer provided a significance test for the Mantel-Haenszel statistic which is distributed as a chi-square with one degree of freedom.

Computer Program

The Mantel-Haenszel computer program used in this research was written by H. Jane Rogers and the third author and had been used in a previous study using this same dataset (Hambleton & Rogers, 1989). The program is written in Fortran V. The program constructs $k + 1$ score groups (where k is the total number of test items) and calculates the MH statistic for all items. It then removes all items with chi-square values significant at the .01 level and recalculates the statistic using the remaining items as the criterion. Because the MH weights cells based on the number of examinees in the cell, empty cells are dropped by the program.

Procedure

Two random samples of 1000 examinees from the available data were selected. One sample consisted of Anglo-American examinees, the other of Native American examinees. The test contained 150 items. The first step in the analysis was to remove those items with very low discrimination ($r < .1$) and that were very easy ($p > .90$). This was done because there seemed to be

little merit in carefully analyzing test items for differential item functioning that were contributing very little to test score variability. The result was a pool of 91 items. Ninety-one test items was a more than adequate number to conduct the planned research.

Both because the computer program used was designed to run a maximum of 75 items, and because previous research had raised issues regarding the stability of the MH and other item bias statistics (Hambleton & Rogers, 1989), the 91 items were divided into three groups. Items were randomly assigned to groups with the stipulation that each group contain 75 items and each item be represented in at least two of the three groups. The MH computer program was then run for each of the three groups separately. Items were identified as differentially functioning only if they were identified as differentially functioning in the tests in which they appeared. This provision was made to reduce the number of items identified as differentially functioning because of Type I errors alone.

In order to examine how the grouping of a set of test items influences the results of the MH procedure, the items were categorized as belonging to one or more of four subsets, and then the MH statistics were recalculated for items in each of the four subtests. Although the original test, too, was divided into subtests, examination of the items within these subtests suggested that placement of an item in a subtest had little to do with the skills required to solve an item (e.g. several of the subtests included items which depended primarily on math skills). The set of subtests used in our research was developed based on the skills required to answer specific items correctly. The following definitions were used in constructing these four subtests:

1. Math: Any item where computations were required to obtain the correct answer.
2. Reading: Any item where the stem contained all of the information needed to obtain the correct answer. That is, no special familiarity or prior knowledge of the item content was required to answer the item.
3. Prior Knowledge: Any item where the stem did not contain sufficient information to allow for a correct answer. Specific prior knowledge on the part of the examinee was needed to answer the item correctly. Included in this category were a number of items for which there appeared to be no clearly best answer. These items appeared to require guessing at what was intended by the item writers. These items are referred to below as "No Clearly Best Answer" (NCBA). Two examples of the NCBA items are provided below:

129. Sid is in the National Guard and has to go to camp for two weeks every summer. When he goes to look for a job, he will be most interested in:

- (A) sick leave policy
- (B) retirement plan
- (C) vacation policy
- (D) profit-sharing plan

(The test is keyed with "C" as the correct answer. However, federal law requires employers to give members of the National Guard leave to fulfill their national guard responsibilities. Therefore, there does not appear to be a best or correct answer.)

130. Flo needs a job that will pay about \$140 a week. She will consider less if the job doesn't call for her to be away from home at night or on weekends. If she's qualified, which of the following jobs would be best for Flo?

- (A) dental assistant; \$125/week, 1 Saturday a month
- (B) legal secretary; \$130/week, Friday afternoon off
- (C) weaver; \$140/week, 11 p.m.-7 a.m. shift
- (D) stock clerk; \$120/week, 10% discount

(The test key shows "B" as the correct answer but both "B" and "C" fulfill the stated requirements.)

4. Charts: Any item where the stem was presented in other than paragraph form. This included charts, graphs, maps, tables, and price lists. Categories 1 to 3 above were mutually exclusive. Items coded as "Charts" were in all cases coded under a second category as well. The MH computer program was run independently for each of these four subtests.

The assignment of items to categories was carried out by the first two authors independently. Initial inter-rater agreement exceeded 90%. Consensus was reached on all items for which there were disagreements before the subtest analyses were conducted.

Finally, three additional subtests were constructed by randomly assigning each of the 91 items to one of three groups. The resulting groups of 30, 31 and 30 items each were analyzed using the MH computer program. These analyses were done to evaluate the extent to which a reduction in the number of items analyzed would be likely to influence the MH statistic, without variation in the item content. Our concern was that the comparison of MH results with the 75-item tests and the shorter subtests was confounded by test length. These analyses, therefore, provided an additional basis for interpreting the findings.

Results

Based on three runs of the MH computer program analyzing a total of 91 items (randomly assigned to groups of 75 with the constraint that each item be included in at least two groups) 22 items were identified as functioning differentially in the Anglo-American and Native American groups. This result is reported in Table 1. All 22 items described in Table 1 were identified as differentially functioning in the 75-item tests in which they appeared. Four additional items would have been identified had the criterion been identification on only one of the two runs.

- - - - -
Insert Table 1 about here.
- - - - -

These 22 differentially functioning items were distributed across the four subtests as follows: 2 in Math, 3 in Reading, 17 in Prior Knowledge, 6 in NCBA, and 4 in Chart. (Recall that the NCBA and Charts subtests overlapped with the other subtests.)

When these four subtests were run, a number of changes in the MH results were observed. In fact, approximately a third of the test items (7 of 22) ceased to be differentially functioning when analyzed within the subtests (1 of the 2 Math, 1 of the 3 Reading, 5 of the 17 Prior Knowledge, and 3 of the 4 Chart items). In general, these results confirmed the original hypothesis that changes in item grouping will change the MH results.

In an effort to better understand these results, the three randomly selected control subtests described above were analyzed. This provided subtests similar in item number to the subtests described above, but without constraints on the skills measured in the subtests. The result of the analysis of control subtest 1 was that none of the items changed in their DIF status. Only minor changes in the DIF of items were noted in the other two subtests as well. The complete results appear in Table 1.

The 12 items classified as "NCBA" provided some support for the validity of the main results. These items were assumed to be truly culturally biased as by definition there was no clearly best answer provided. A "guess" as to what the item writer intended seemed to be required in these items, and it is reasonable to expect that Native American examinees would be at a disadvantage compared to majority group examinees. Six of the 12 NCBA items were differentially functioning in the two groups in the 75-item test and remained

so in the subtest analyses. There was 100% agreement. Culturally biased test items were consistently identified regardless of the subtest in which they were located. This result contrasts sharply with the results of the other 37 items in this subtest for which there was a clearly best answer. Eleven of these 37 items were identified as DIF in the 75-item test. Five of these items were not so labelled in the subtest. The shift in results was 45% (5 of 11). A complete analysis of the comparison of DIF and Non-DIF items in the 75-item test and the various subtests of interest appears in Table 2.

- - - - -
Insert Table 2 about here.
- - - - -

A less easily predicted phenomena was also noted as a result of the subgroup runs (see Table 1). In each case, some items not previously identified as DIF were classified as such by these runs. Two additional Math items, 3 additional Reading items, 5 additional Prior Knowledge items (including two in the NCBA group), and 4 additional Chart items were identified. When only the mutually exclusive subtests were considered, allowing each of the 91 items to be analyzed only once, 10 new DIF items were identified, out of a total of 69 not previously identified. This is well beyond the number which might be expected due to chance alone using the .01 significance level.

Discussion

The results presented above suggest that test developers using the MH statistic to assess item bias in tests should be cautious in interpreting the results. When the original set of items analyzed here were regrouped and reassessed within separate subtests, 32% of the differentially functioning

items (7 of 22) were no longer found to be differentially functioning. This represents 8% of the total item pool and is well beyond what would be expected as a typical false positive error rate using a .01 significance level. To what extent the substantially differing ability distributions for the majority and minority samples exaggerated this affect is an empirical question, but it may be prudent for test developers to be especially cautious when such differences exist. It appears that the context (test) in which items are studied can (and will) influence the results. Practitioners might be encouraged, for example, when conducting large item calibration and DIF studies, to consider groupings of test items as one of the variables in preparing a test design.

The data analyzed here also revealed an unpredicted and less easily explained phenomenon. Namely, when items were grouped into subtests and then re-analyzed within these subtests, the percentage of DIF items increased. This result was consistent across all subtests, including the three "Control" subtests. The control subtests differed from the original test only in number of items. Thus, in general, as the length of the test decreased, the number of additional items identified as DIF increased. Again, this result may have serious implications for test developers using the MH statistic. Specific recommendations for test developers in this area must await further research.

One final finding of the present study is the apparent usefulness of the NCBA subcategory within the Prior Knowledge subtest. Fifty percent of the items classified as NCBA were shown to be DIF. Although it is assumed that most test developers routinely exclude all items fitting this definition, the presence of such items in this test provides clear evidence of convergence between the statistical and judgmental approaches to identifying bias. Such convergence has not generally been reported in the literature (see, for

example, Plake, 1980). In the case of these items, not only is the classification of NCBA a good indicator of the likelihood of statistically demonstrable bias, but all of the six items in this category originally identified as DIF remained in that status when re-analyzed as part of the Prior Knowledge subtest. This kind of convergence would seem to argue for validity of both the statistical and judgmental techniques employed.

Although these results should provide some cautions to test developers using the MH statistic and suggest the need for additional study, the nature of the data analyzed provides little basis for a theoretical explanation of the findings. It is, for example, impossible to make meaningful statements regarding the relative accuracy of the alternate MH runs. It could be argued that items showing a change in status across runs (i.e., across criteria) should be considered non-biased. This would be a conservative stand with respect to Type I error. However, for the argument to stand, it is necessary to know the power characteristics of the MH statistic, particularly for varying test lengths. Another issue raised but not resolved by these data is the impact of dimensionality on the MH. Although there are several indices of dimensionality in common use, none have been shown to be dependable (Hattie, 1985). The results described above may be explained at least in part by changes in dimensionality of the regrouped tests. Initial analysis examining indices such as the ratio of the first to second eigenvalues (Ackerman, 1989) did not show clear support for a change in dimensionality. However, these indices may be confounded by test length. As with the power issue referred to above, the part dimensionality plays in these results may best be examined with a simulation study so that the level of differential functioning as well as the dimensionality can be specified.

In conclusion, it can be stated that these data raise important questions regarding the way the MH statistic functions. Additional research is needed to determine the extent to which these results can be generalized to other test data and to provide a theoretical explanation of the results. The data presented here strongly suggest that the phenomena observed represent systematic rather than random occurrences. To the extent that these results are generalizable to other data sets, they may lead to the development of important guidelines for test developers in using the MH statistic.

References

- Ackerman, T. A. (1989). Unidimensional IRT calibration of compensatory and non-compensatory multidimensional items. Applied Psychological Measurement, 13, 113-127.
- Bennett, R. E., Rock, D. A., & Novatkoski, I. (1989). Differential item functioning on the SAT-M Braille Edition. Journal of Educational Measurement, 26(1), 67-79.
- Berk, R. A. (Ed.). (1982). Handbook of methods for detecting test bias. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bollwark, J., Hambleton, R. K., & Rogers, H. J. (1990). Factors affecting the stability of the Mantel-Haenszel item bias statistic (Laboratory of Psychometric and Evaluative Research, Report No. 203). Amherst, MA: School of Education, University of Massachusetts.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Rogers, H. J. (1989). Detecting potentially biased test items: Comparison of IRT area and Mantel-Haenszel methods. Applied Measurement in Education, 2(4), 313-334.
- Hattie, J. A. (1985). Methodological review: Assessing unidimensionality of tests and items. Applied Psychological Measurement, 9, 139-164.
- Holland, P. W., & Thayer, D. T. (1988). Differential item performance and the Mantel-Haenszel procedure. In H. Wainer & H. I. Braun (Eds.), Test Validity (pp.129-145). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Mellenbergh, G. J. (1989). Item bias and item response theory. International Journal of Educational Research, 13(2), 127-143.

- Plake, B. S. (1980). A comparison of a statistical and subjective procedure to ascertain item validity: One step in the test validation process. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 397-404.
- Raju, N. S., Bode, R. K., & Larsen, V. S. (1989). An empirical assessment of the Mantel-Haenszel statistic for studying differential item performance. Applied Measurement in Education, 2(1), 1-13.
- Scheuneman, J., & Bleistein, C. A. (1989). A consumer's guide to statistics for identifying differential item functioning. Applied Measurement in Education, 2(3), 255-275.
- Zwick, R., & Ercikan, K. (1989). Analysis of differential item functioning in the NAEP history assessment. Journal of Educational Measurement, 26(1), 55-66.

Table 1
Analysis of Differential Item Functioning (DIF)

Category	Total*	Subtests							
		Math Reading		Prior Knowledge		Charts	Control Subtest		
				All	NCBA		1	2	3
Number of Items	91	27	15	49	12	19	30	31	30
Number of DIF Items in the 75-Item Test	22	2	3	17	6	4	7	7	8
Number of Items Which Were No Longer DIF When Analyzed Within a Subtest	7	1	1	5	0	3	0	1	3
Number of New Items Identified as DIF When Analyzed Within a Subtest	11	2	3	5	2	4	2	5	5

* Because "NCBA" and "Charts" are not mutually exclusive of the other three subtest categories, results in the Total column cannot be found by summing across subtest results.

Table 2

Comparison of DIF and Non-DIF Items in the Total and Subtests

Subtest	Total Test	Subtest		Level of Agreement
		DIF	Non-DIF	
Math (27)	DIF	1	1	88.9%
	Non-DIF	2	23	
Reading (15)	DIF	2	1	73.3%
	Non-DIF	3	9	
Prior Knowledge (49)	DIF	12	5	79.5%
	Non-DIF	5	27	
Prior Knowledge (37) (Factual)	DIF	6	5	78.3%
	Non-DIF	3	23	
Knowledge (12) (NCBA)	DIF	6	0	83.3%
	Non-DIF	2	4	
Charts (19)	DIF	1	3	63.2%
	Non-DIF	4	11	
Control 1 (30)	DIF	7	0	93.3%
	Non-DIF	2	21	
Control 2 (31)	DIF	6	1	80.6%
	Non-DIF	5	19	
Control 3 (30)	DIF	5	3	73.3%
	Non-DIF	5	17	